DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 332 936 SO 030 133

TITLE	Beyond Creating: Roundtable Series.
INSTITUTION	Getty Center for Education in the Arts, Los Angeles, CA.
PUB DATE	86
NOTE	104p.; For a related document, see SO 030 130.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Education; *Aesthetic Education; *Art Criticism; *Art Education; Art Expression; Art History; Creative Expression; *Curriculum Development; *Educational Philosophy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Sequential Approach
IDENTIFIERS	*Discipline Based Art Education; Getty Center for Education in the Arts

ABSTRACT

This report documents the proceedings from a series of four regional roundtable discussions sponsored by the Getty Center for Education in the Arts. Representatives including arts educators, educational leaders, school administrators, artists, elected officials, and arts organization members were brought together to discuss practical aspects of the arts. The purpose of these meetings was to gather feedback from specialists who were asked to read and react to the paper "Beyond Creating: The Place for Art in America's Schools" that introduced the concept of discipline-based art education. The topics of the roundtables were as follows: Roundtable I: "Academic Rigor and the Development of Written, Sequential Curricula for Discipline-Based Art Education"; Roundtable II: "The Role of the Art Education Advocate"; Roundtable III: "The Place for Creative Expression in a Discipline-Based Art Education Curriculum"; and Roundtable IV: "Resources--Financial and Administrative--for a Discipline-Based Art Education Program." The report contains a foreword by Leilani Duke, an introduction, and executive summaries of each roundtable session. An average of forty invited guests attended each of the roundtables and the main body of the document reflects their comments at each proceeding. An appendix is included that lists all of the participants at the four roundtables. (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

PROCEEDINGS REPORT

ED382936

Beyond Creating Roundtable Series

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
VICKIE J. ROSENBERG
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 020 133

Sponsored by
The Getty Center for Education in the Arts

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD
Leilani Lattin Duke ii

INTRODUCTION 1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARIES 3

ROUNDTABLE I
"Academic Rigor and the Development of Written,
Sequential Curricula for Discipline-Based Art Education" 7

ROUNDTABLE II
"The Role of the Art Education Advocate" 23

ROUNDTABLE III
"The Place for Creative Expression in a
Discipline-Based Art Education Curriculum" 47

ROUNDTABLE IV
"Resources--Financial and Administrative--
for a Discipline-Based Art Education Program" 60

APPENDIX: ROUNDTABLE PARTICIPANTS 81

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 96

FOREWORD

It seems apparent to many that this decade presents opportunities to shape the future of arts education. Today, leaders of educational change are making their voices heard, and propositions for progressive change are receiving greater public attention. It is with a sense of participation in this process that the Getty Center for Education in the Arts releases a Proceedings Report on the "Beyond Creating Roundtable Series."

The release of these findings marks another stage in our process, not an end. We have felt a sense of progress in the four years since the Center was founded, but we are realistic in the knowledge that a long road lies ahead.

The Getty Center for Education in the Arts, an operating entity of the J. Paul Getty Trust, was created to contribute to improving the quality and status of arts education in America's schools. Our immediate aim is to help change the public's perception of the value of visual art education and to contribute to the growing national debate on what constitutes excellence in art education.

The Center's year-long study of public school arts education programs, particularly those in the visual arts, revealed that most instruction stressed hands-on artmaking activities. The Center agrees with many leaders in the arts education field that children were not receiving sufficient instruction in the cultural

and historical contributions of art or in how to analyze, interpret, and value works of art.

Out of this study came the Center's conviction that if art education is to be included as a basic subject in a balanced curriculum, it would need to teach content and skills from the disciplines that contribute to understanding art: creating art, art history, art criticism, and aesthetics. This approach has come to be known as "discipline-based art education." In adopting this approach, the Center has adopted a position that has been advocated in the field of art education for two decades.

The Center first presented its views publicly in a report released in 1985 entitled Beyond Creating: The Place for Art in America's Schools. Featured in the report were profiles of seven school districts around the country which are attempting to develop discipline-based art education programs. Beyond Creating informed the Center's policy-making and program decisions. It also reached an even larger, broader public with its message that art education has important value and that it is fundamental to a child's educational development. To date, 40,000 copies of this report have been distributed.

While the Center believes firmly in the concept of discipline-based art education, we also recognize that this approach will have many variations as it is tailored to the educational needs of individual school districts. The development of an effective discipline-based approach is a shared responsibility. Collective

action, cooperation and coalition-building are essential if we are to illuminate the value of art education.

The Getty Center recently sponsored a series of four regional roundtables that are described in the accompanying reports. Representatives from arts education, education, and the arts were brought together at each roundtable to discuss one practical aspect of discipline-based art education. Their comments not only helped us better understand how the approach might be implemented, but also underscored the work that remains to be done.

What comes next? The Center will host its first invitational conference on discipline-based art education in Los Angeles from January 15-17, 1987. Arts educators and advocates, artists, education leaders, and public officials will discuss the forms that discipline-based art education might take in coming years.

What will come of this conference remains to be seen, though our hopes are high. What is certain even now is that the Getty Center for Education in the Arts will continue to commit itself to elevating the status of art education in our communities and schools, and to building the broadest possible base of support in order for these changes to be deep and enduring. We look forward to working together with those who share these common goals.

Leilani Lattin Duke
Director
The Getty Center for Education in the Arts

INTRODUCTION

The following reports document the proceedings of the "Beyond Creating Roundtable Series" sponsored by the Getty Center for Education in the Arts. Four roundtables were held around the country. Their locations, dates and topics were as follows:

Roundtable I: Boston, Massachusetts (October 28, 1985)
"Academic Rigor and the Development of Written, Sequential Curricula for Discipline-Based Art Education"

Roundtable II: Seattle, Washington (December 3, 1985)
"The Role of the Art Education Advocate"

Roundtable III: New Orleans, Louisiana (April 3, 1986)
"The Place for Creative Expression in a Discipline-Based Art Education Curriculum"

Roundtable IV: Chicago, Illinois (May 1, 1986)
"Resources--Financial and Administrative--for a Discipline-Based Art Education Program"

The purpose of these meetings was to gather feedback from art and education specialists who were asked to read and react to Beyond Creating: The Place for Art in America's Schools. This report from the Getty Center introduces the concept that art education should be discipline-based--that is, that it should include content and skills from four disciplines that contribute to understanding art: creating art, art history, art criticism, and aesthetics.

An average of forty invited guests attended each of the round-tables. They included arts educators, educational leaders, school administrators, artists, elected officials, arts organization representatives, and others. Prior to finalizing this "Proceedings

Report," participants from each roundtable were given an opportunity to comment on the accuracy of the reporting. The document that follows reflects their comments.

A note about terminology: In some instances, terms used very specifically in the context of Beyond Creating and the Getty Center's research were used more generally by roundtable participants. One notable example is the use of "art" vs. "arts" and "art education" vs. "arts education." The Center uses the singular because its work to date has focused specifically on visual art. In discussion, however, roundtable participants frequently used the plural form to encompass all the arts--visual, performing, and literary.

In this and all other such cases, the terminology employed in the following document reflects actual usage.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARIES

ROUNDTABLE I: "Academic Rigor and the Development of Written, Sequential Curricula for Discipline-Based Art Education."

During the morning, participants cited factors pertaining to advocacy, the teaching environment and cultural influences as encouraging the development of written, sequential curricula. Among the constraining factors were concerns at the school level, community indifference, and the perception of discipline-based art education as elitist, academic, and lacking a solid conceptual base in art, child development and historical precedents. In the discussion that followed, the Center's views were further clarified.

In his luncheon address, Harvard University's Project Zero Co-Director Dr. Howard Gardner noted that, despite the efforts of many over the years, art education had yet to become an important part of the national agenda. He cited lessons that he believed could be learned from past disappointments. He described Project Zero's work in how children learn and in the importance of symbol systems as providing an intellectual foundation for future efforts. In closing, he introduced the "moral" of his address: the need for art education to develop as a substitute for consumerism. Art, he said, has the potential to perform this function.

The balance of the meeting was devoted to identifying a range of issues to be considered in translating the discipline-based art education concept into action in the schools.

ROUNDTABLE II: "The Role of the Art Education Advocate."

Discussion initially focused on the factors that encourage or constrain advocacy for a discipline-based approach. Those cited were grouped in seven categories: defining art education to include diverse cultures and audiences; professional training; networking; communication; reaching parents; the value of art to society; and school administrative structures. One participant maintained that there were really three basic factors: money, ownership and clout.

Among the encouraging factors cited were strong networking and communication among educators and others; the universality of the arts; the search for more effective ways to educate children; the requirement of a unit or more in the arts for graduation; and a higher level of visibility for the arts and arts education.

Among the constraining factors were the lack of a clear, concerted message from arts advocates; the lack of equity for the arts in school budgets; the isolation that teachers feel; the attitude that the arts are a frill; the low regard that the public has for arts education; the inflexibility in daily class schedules and course requirements; and the elitist image of the arts.

The afternoon was devoted to identifying a number of "process elements" that are likely to appear in a sound advocacy plan, then to identifying specific targets (or audiences) for a concerted advocacy effort and the role these targets could play. The targets were grouped at seven levels: national, state, regional, school district, building, classroom, and children themselves.

ROUNDTABLE III: "The Place for Creative Expression in a Discipline-Based Art Education Curriculum."

Though concern had been expressed that a discipline-based approach might stifle creativity, those present seemed more concerned about other factors that they feared worked against creative expression.

The incentives for maintaining such expression, they said, included increased skills--in communication, cognition and other areas. Factors cited which constrain creative expression included inadequate preparation of art teachers and inadequate in-service training; indifference or ignorance on the part of parents, administrators and the general public; and limited time, money, energy and supplies. Items specific to each of these areas were listed by the group. Participants also speculated on how art teachers have unwittingly contributed to the constraints that art education has experienced.

During the afternoon session, the group identified several processes that might influence the role for creative expression and concluded by noting seven areas in which work could occur. Again, factors which encourage or constrain creative expression in discipline-based art education were cited for each of these areas: creative expression in the classroom; conveying an understanding of discipline-based art education; art education in general; the educational system; the community; the family and the individual; and political structures.

ROUNDTABLE IV: "Resources—Administrative and Financial—for a Discipline-Based Art Education Program."

Much of the morning was devoted to panel presentations by representatives of two of the school districts described in Beyond Creating: Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and Decatur, Illinois. Four panelists detailed how art education programs had been established, staffed and funded in their districts.

In the discussion that followed, panelists addressed questions on the use of art specialists and the in-service program in the Decatur system; and on the use of critics, aestheticians, and art historians in both Decatur and Milwaukee. Discussion also addressed the issue of necessary administrative and financial resources for art education. A final question in this phase of the roundtable concerned the limitations of time and resources available to busy administrators.

The group also identified factors that encourage or constrain "freeing up administrative and financial resources for discipline-based art education." An inventory was compiled of "process mechanisms" that can help free up these resources.

In the afternoon, participants divided into five groups to identify additional processes that can draw support at the state and national level, at the school and community level, and within the school district. An extensive list of processes was developed. The group concluded by describing six sequential steps that should be taken in securing financial and administrative support.

ROUNDTABLE I

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

OCTOBER 28, 1985

At the outset of Roundtable I it was pointed out that although the concept of discipline-based art education has been part of arts education literature for some twenty years, it has not been widely practiced in classrooms. In the Getty Center's view, visual art education has failed to become an integral subject in the curriculum because it has not been perceived by the public as a "serious" subject. To improve the status of art education, the Center believes, its content needs to become more comprehensive by integrating content and skills from the disciplines that contribute to understanding art: creating art, art history, art criticism and aesthetics.

Roundtable I addressed the need for written, sequential curricula to support a discipline-based approach. Specifically, the Center wanted to know from those attending what forces encourage or constrain the acceptance and support of a discipline-based art education approach. The group's conclusions would also help shape the agenda for a national conference on art education which the Center will conduct on January 15-17, 1987, in Los Angeles.

As directed, roundtable participants formed small working groups to draw up their lists of encouraging and constraining factors. However, as the facilitator would later point out, some seemed unprepared to accept the premise that a discipline-based approach to art education was desirable. The list-making generally began as questioning, and the clarification that many seemed to feel the concept required was evident in the long lists of

needs and constraints and the much shorter lists of encouragments that resulted.

While some participants observed that the list of factors encouraging a discipline-based approach should simply be the converse of the constraints, a number of items were specifically cited:

Advocacy

Among the factors mentioned were the importance of including key people in the development of the concept of discipline-based art education; the consciousness-raising effect of the Getty Center's activities; the appearance of other national reports urging arts education; and the support of parents, administrators and community leaders.

Teaching Environment

Participants cited as positive factors the increased interaction between artists and school programs; the effect of outreach programs sponsored by museums; better collaboration between schools and cultural institutions; the complementary nature of programs at schools and local art centers; improved communications between schools and state departments of education; and improved visual environments in cities and towns.

Cultural Influences

Factors noted by the group included increased experimentation with art by adolescents; the ability of art to foster inter-racial

harmony; the impact of America's search for a cultural heritage as it seeks to define itself; and the potential of recent immigrant groups to become more culturally aware and involved.

In addition, several encouraging factors related specifically to the State of Massachusetts were also mentioned. These included increased funding for the arts; the current review of high school diploma requirements; the existence of the Commonwealth In-Service Institute; certain aspects of the new Massachusetts education bill; and the heavy concentration in the state of institutions of higher education offering art training for teachers.

The constraining factors cited by the reporting groups seemed to fall into three categories: those related to the reaction at the school level to the concept of discipline-based art education; those pertaining to the broader community reaction; and those that were grounded in the general perception of (and philosophical questions about) the discipline-based concept. Specific constraints were as follows:

School-Related

Participants cited the lack of teacher preparedness and inadequate ongoing training; the possible rigidity of discipline-based curricula; the difficulty in teaching both cognitively and affectively; the resistance of older teachers and administrators who are more set in their ways; the belief that schools are not organized in a way that encourages art education; the competition for staff,

money and time; the tendency of students to take "bottom line" courses; the fear of getting a pre-packaged curriculum implemented from the "top down" without teacher input, and that it might be developed nationally instead of regionally; the insecurity of art specialists now in the schools; the concern that ethnic minorities and students with special needs may be neglected; and the concern that the discipline-based approach will be too academic, ignoring the making of art in favor of discourse about it.

Community-Related

Among the constraints were the low regard that the public has for art education; the absence of strong, knowledgeable leadership and the indifference of top officials; the ineffectiveness of school administrators as community advocates; the lack of appreciation that the public has for the amount of time needed to effect curriculum changes; the difficulty of communicating the concept of discipline-based art education; and the lack of political astuteness among arts advocates in general.

General Perception/Philosophical Questions

Participants referred to the possible dichotomy between the nature of art and of a discipline-based approach to teaching it; the lack of consensus for such an approach and for emphasizing visual art; the lack of recognition of literacy in all its forms; the perception of discipline-based art education either as a fad or as elitist and mono-cultural; the seeming absence of a strong concep-

tual base in art, child development and historical precedents; the perception that the concept does not incorporate the needs of children or recognize how children learn; and the concern that living artists and contemporary art will be overlooked in a discipline-based approach to teaching art.

One group anticipated the afternoon's discussion by reporting not a list of constraints, but three agreed-upon needs followed by several questions.

They agreed, they said, that art education needed to be strengthened; that adequate funding was needed for program and teacher training; and that funding needed to be on a regional rather than national basis to encourage full discourse. Beyond that, however, they would like the following questions answered:

--Can discipline-based art education be justified over other methods of art education?

--To what extent are living artists and living art among the basic elements of the approach?

--In what ways have previously funded national efforts informed this model?

--Beyond strengthening art in the schools, what are the values and beliefs inherent in this model?

--How does the approach incorporate the cultural and social realities of today?

Following the small-group reports, both Leilani Lattin Duke and other roundtable participants commented individually on what had been said.

Ms. Duke thanked the groups for their observations and offere

several follow-up points and clarifications. First of all, she said, the Getty Center for Education in the Arts was not planning to develop one monolithic national curriculum, but instead will encourage a variety of approaches under the discipline-based art education heading. Any curriculum that is developed should reflect the approach being espoused, and the question of curricula and approaches deserves further examination at the planned national symposium, she said.

She also announced that three art educators had been commissioned by the Center to write a monograph whose purpose would be to lay out the various elements of the discipline-based art education concept. This prompted a teacher to urge that classroom teachers be involved in the development of the monograph. "Don't leave us out or deliver to us from on high," she said. Ms. Duke responded that once drafted, the monograph will be critiqued by a group of 110 elementary and secondary art teachers, higher education art educators, artists, art historians, art critics and aestheticians. Following this review, it will be presented at the planned national symposium.

Ellie Lazarus, Director of the DeCordova Museum School, took issue with one of the encouraging factors cited earlier. Local arts center programs had proved in her experience to be a constraint, not an encouragement, because school administrators tended to use their existence as an excuse for not programming the arts in the schools.

On the issue of elitism, Anita Page, Principal of the South Hadley High School in Amherst, Massachusetts, voiced her hope that the caution about elitism would be taken seriously. Intellectuality, she said, tended to be taken as elitism, and the approach may be open to that charge. In response, Betty Bowker, Chairman of the Art Department at the Boston English High School, argued that the question is not one of the degree of intellectuality, but of the type. Her fear, she said, was that less traditional kinds of aptitude and intelligence may be ignored in pursuit of a more academic ideal. Added Judith Burton, Associate Professor at Boston University, there is general agreement that more rigor is needed in arts education, but what kind of rigor? It is the emphasis on academic rigor in Beyond Creating--learning about art via received opinion rather than through its practice--that leaves the concept open to the charge of elitism.

Dr. Bart O'Connor, Superintendent of the Attleboro Public Schools, suggested that before curricula comprised of content from the four art disciplines are developed, better arguments would be needed to sell the discipline-based approach. More support and a more thorough conceptual background would be crucial in that effort, and both should be high priorities for the Getty Center.

***

Dr. Howard Gardner, Co-Director of Harvard University's Project Zero, opened his luncheon address by noting the importance of

the occasion. Thanks to the Getty Center, he said, arts education has a chance to become part of the national agenda. "But it is sobering to note that we have had the opportunity before--with the Office of Education, with CEMREL, with Coming to Our Senses--and yet nothing much has come of it. Indeed, the lack of impact is striking."

Dr. Gardner cited three lessons that he believed could be learned from these disappointing experiences. First, that we must avoid empty truisms in making the case for art education, such as "art uplifts the spirit." Second, that we must avoid unjustifiable promises, for example, that art education results in improved reading or writing skills. And third, that we must concede (or forcefully parry, if appropriate) the criticisms of art and art education.

Apologizing in advance for the abbreviated nature of his comments on the work of Project Zero, Dr. Gardner suggested that the Project's twenty years of accumulated evidence might begin to serve as a "conceptual base" for the Getty Center's approach to discipline-based art education.

"Let us begin with a value statement," he said. "The purpose of education, in the broadest sense, is to develop human cognitive potentials to the fullest. With cognition developed to the fullest, individuals have a range of options of how to use their minds, as well as access to the greatest products of other minds." What is unique about the human mind, Dr. Gardner said, is that we

use symbols--such as words, pictures, gestures, and tonal patterns--to express and perceive meanings. "A large part of education, therefore, involves becoming literate with different kinds of symbol systems. And any comprehensive assault on literacy must also include literacy in artistic symbol systems."

If he were able to summarize twenty years of Project Zero research in one sentence, he said, it might be this: "Art education should involve the training of individuals so that they are sensitive to those aspects of symbols--style, expression, composition, and multiple meanings--that constitute the core of artistic activity." Such an enterprise, he added, "requires the same regular representation in the curriculum that 'real disciplines' enjoy."

As for discipline-based art education, Dr. Gardner said, so far it is "largely a slogan--a good and effective slogan, but one in which danger lurks." Part of the danger, he said, is that in pursuit of discipline, there is "a temptation to invoke the regular, workaday curriculum." But discipline-based art education should not mean just facts, tests, and reading and writing in natural language about the arts. It should, he argued, be much more adventurous.

Detailing the qualities he would like to see in discipline-based art education, Dr. Gardner said that the approach taken "should highlight those symbol systems which are underplayed in the schools--like picturing, music, and gesture. It should move beyond standardized tests to having individuals make value judg-

ments, fine-grained comparisons, and imaginative leaps. It should involve students in meaningful, long-term projects. It should not despise artistic activity or creating nor depart too far from the artistic medium. And finally, it should not be a traditional discipline lurking under a new garb."

What was needed, he said, was new curricula that worked with artistic media and symbol systems. The new interest in art education, he said--including the interest of the Getty Center--provided an important opportunity to accomplish this.

In closing, Dr. Gardner introduced what he called "the moral" of his address.

"There is an area in which kids are aesthetically sophisticated--indeed, too sophisticated--and it is consumerism. Kids may not know about Franz Kline, but they know about Calvin Klein. They may not know about Levi Strauss on myth, but they are expert on Levi Strauss jeans. I would like to see art education develop as a substitute for consumerism: Beyond Consumerism rather than Beyond Creating. The same kind of discriminating skills which children now apply to clothing or computers, watches or wardrobes, ought to be applied to symbolic statements which matter. To borrow from William James, we need a moral equivalent of consumerism.

"This needn't be hard to achieve," he concluded. "After all, art is free, it's non-competitive, and there's enough to go around....It makes a society worth being proud of: not capitalism or consumerism or discipline for its own sake, but as a means to

allow us to enjoy and to contribute to the artistic legacy whereby any civilization will ultimately be judged."

***

Following lunch, the roundtable reconvened to consider the question for the afternoon discussion: What down-to-earth, practical issues need to be considered in order to translate the discipline-based art education concept into action in the schools? Now, with the assistance of the facilitator, the roundtable reconvened to address that topic.

Before considering the question, however, a number of participants sought to comment further on the discipline-based art education concept. Among the views expressed was the belief that the concept needed much more clarification. There was no consensus yet, one person said, that discipline-based art education was the best way to move art education forward. Concern was expressed again that the discipline-based art education approach could favor learning about art over creating it, and reassurance was called for by some that creating art would always be chief among the four content components in this approach. "The intent of art education, as with any education, should be to be human affirmative," said Barry Gaither, Director of the Museum of the National Center for Afro-American Artists. "In art education, the making of the product is the central product. We don't want language about art to substitute for the act of making art."

Several people commented on the course of the discussion itself. Asserted one, "We need to participate with the Getty Center in a strong, national statement that art education is important. We should guard against being distracted from that larger purpose." Another responded that the questions, issues and concerns expressed in Boston will ultimately need to be addressed if discipline-based art education programs are to be implemented nationally.

At this point, roundtable participants formed two separate discussion groups, each to address one of the following questions: 1) How can discipline-based art education be implemented in the national, state, and community arenas? 2) What are the issues that need to be clarified in the concept called discipline-based art education?

Group One, reporting on the first of these questions, cited the following implementation strategies:

--secure funding at each level (national, state, and local)

--identify the leadership at each level; especially important to have an advocate in the state office of education

--develop, finance and mobilize a lobbying effort

--push for legislation and policy at each level

--establish a model program at each level

--conduct evaluations and replications of the model programs

--retrain administrators, classroom teachers, and art teachers

--establish task forces at the state and local levels to design quality curricula, including rationales, mission statements,

goals and objectives, instructional strategies, and evaluation methods; task forces should represent special needs, educators, parents, curriculum specialists, child development experts, and others as appropriate

--conduct pilot programs, after the task forces are complete, at specific grade levels to demonstrate developed curricula

--establish a motivation strategy to sell the concept to state and local decision-makers

--conduct reliable research and secure good data on the national level to back up the state and local efforts

--develop strategies for measuring the gains that children make

--seek a 15-year minimum commitment at state and local levels

Reporting on the second of these questions, Group Two posed the following for consideration:

--How can a renewed commitment and new support be gotten for art education?

--To secure that commitment, how can rigor be incorporated into art education? (More discussion of this should have been in Beyond Creating.)

--Is it possible to make the scope of the approach larger and to broaden the definitions of some of the terms and concepts?

--Is it possible to get a clearer definition of the four content components, as well as an explanation of how they developed conceptually?

--Can the approach be more integrated? (A discipline-based approach suggests a narrowing, and that's a concern.)

--Can more be said about the values that are involved in the process of art education? What values are implied in the teaching of it?

--How can the discipline-based model being discussed be made more poly-cultural?

--How can teachers know when learning is taking place in a discipline-based program?

--Can the terms "art criticism" and "aesthetics" be defined more specifically as they pertain to the application of the discipline-based art education approach?

--What assurances are there that the making of art will be of preeminent importance?

--In what ways does the approach take into consideration how children learn?

--What is our motivation in teaching art education, and how does it fit into our society?

Additionally, some questions specific to the Getty Center were also raised:

--Who are the seminal thinkers used for the Center's discipline-based art education model?

--How will the Center provide for broader ownership of the ideas it develops, as well as broader input in the development of the monograph?

--What assurances are there that ongoing ideas presented to the Center will find their way into its reports?

--How will the Getty Center avoid a "top-down" approach in implementing discipline-based art education?

--Finally, in evaluating other model programs, was the Getty Center's evaluation based upon the presence or absence of the four discipline-based content components, or upon studio work? In short, what measurement tools were used and what learning was evaluated.

Following these reports, Howard Gardner noted that it was interesting that the two groups formed so readily: one willing to talk about implementation without being too concerned about the concept, and the other feeling that the conceptual base needed more clarification. Both forces, he said, would be needed throughout this developmental process; both would be central to

the eventual success of discipline-based art education.

***

In closing, the participants in Boston's Roundtable I pointed to a number of factors which they said enhanced or detracted from the discussions.

Evaluations were positive for the small-group format, receiving materials in advance, the diversity and levels of the participants, the process and quality of the dialogue, the group's sense of its own influence, the hopefulness of spirit, the pointed luncheon address, the differing points of view expressed, and the latitude and tolerance that the Getty Center demonstrated.

Questions were raised concerning the shortness of time for the session, for starting with a given set of assumptions, for the absence of a list of participants and their affiliations, for some of the methods for small-group reports, and for assuming only one topic for the afternoon's discussion.

Roundtable I closed with the request that those present be kept informed of what other roundtables discuss and that all reports be circulated widely.

ROUNDTABLE II

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

DECEMBER 3, 1985

Roundtable II began with a brief review of the Getty Center's position that a discipline-based approach to art education is applicable to classroom practice. The Center's research, which included the case studies described in Beyond Creating, had not only produced support for this position but had also demonstrated that there are many different ways of developing and implementing a discipline-based art program.

Instead of treating Beyond Creating as an end in itself, it is being used to help generate comment that will shape the Center's policy-planning process and its national conference on January 15-17, 1987. To contribute to this process, the participants in the Seattle meeting were being asked to address "the whole issue of art education advocacy: who the advocates are, what the current issues and strategies are, and what it takes for art education to become a regular subject in a balanced curriculum." The morning session would ask specifically, "What are some of the factors that encourage or constrain advocacy for a discipline-based art education approach?"

The conference facilitator asked the participants to address this question from the perspective of national art education advocates. He also asked that, one-by-one, they cite what they believed were the major factors that must be considered in any well-informed discussion about art advocacy.

Commenting later on what the morning session produced, Ray Thompson of the School of Fine and Performing Arts at Seattle

Pacific University grouped these factors into several areas: defining arts education to include diverse cultures and audiences; professional training; networking; communication; and reaching parents. These are the themes, he said--with adequate funding as a constant refrain--that keep recurring in educators' discussions about how to improve the standing of arts education.

Two additional themes could be added to Mr. Thompson's grouping: the value of art to society, and school administrative structures.

Seattle School Board member Jerry Saulter identified what he believed were three major considerations for arts advocates: money, because when budgets are being cut back, arts spending must constantly be justified; ownership, because more people need to 'buy into' the importance of both the arts and of their presence in our lives; and clout, because arts advocates need to be in positions of influence where they can affect budget processes."

Dr. Carol Scott, also from the School of Fine and Performing Arts at Seattle Pacific University, followed Mr. Saulter's assessment with her own. "We need to demystify and de-exoticize the arts, and we need to practice the notion that the arts are for everyone," she said. "We can't just educate those who show early talent. Furthermore, we need to prepare teachers to teach aesthetic growth, not just skills. We need funding, and we need to develop an arts-eager attitude in our children at an early age. Finally, we need hard data and research that backs up how we grow

and learn artistically; parents are hungry for reliable information on early childhood development."

Among them, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Saulter, and Ms. Scott touched on most of the concerns raised by the roundtable participants. Specific factors cited (many of which could be grouped in more than one category) were as follows:

Value of Art to Society

--The fact that Americans in general seem not to value the arts makes our task as advocates that much more difficult.

--What's important is passion. Understanding the passion and potential in art is crucial, as is the ability to communicate it and share it through objects, performances, literature, and discussions.

--Excellence in education, with which the arts are associated, must be preceded by equity in education. We can't confine ourselves to the "nice" issues. What about the heritage of so many Asian children whose parents were kept in internment camps during the Second World War? What about the effort to establish a Black museum in Seattle?

--When "mainstream" educators, such as science or math teachers, believe in the importance of the arts, that's a great help. And why shouldn't they? The arts can and should be a part of every aspect of our personal, family, and work lives.

Communication

--Education has to be more than a collection of facts. Arts education in particular needs to reveal what is good, true, beautiful, and important if arts teachers are to reach students, parents, and others.

--It's of the utmost importance that we help young people learn to use the arts to understand more about their own time, which means making the arts relevant for them.

--We need to re-educate the arts community to the importance of arts education, and that community must speak with one voice.

--We're still struggling to communicate the message that arts education is valuable. Have we been hurt by extravagant claims in the past about arts education that have failed to materialize?

Networking

--Networking is critical. Among other things, we need it so that teachers and schools can hear about more "how-to" and success stories. We need it to help resolve the inferiority complexes that so many educators have about teaching the arts.

--The lack of unity among teachers within school districts makes effective advocacy difficult. Territoriality and ego are also obstacles to achievement; we need to work together, trust one another, and believe that we can succeed.

--We need to facilitate networking among teachers, administrators, and community groups. This requires being more aware of the needs and concerns of each party.

--Arts organizations need to be more supportive of arts education; they need to develop an "educational attitude."

--Artists need to be more involved as teachers, advocates, and spokespeople; a professional relationship between the artist and the arts advocate is nearly as important as funding.

Reaching Parents

--Parents have a tremendous interest in arts education--though it is hard to reconcile this interest with the specialization in education and the devaluation of art in society. Nevertheless, a growing number of parents seem to want a more holistic approach to their own lives and to those of their children.

--We need to involve parents more if they are to be convinced that arts education is a basic. When they're struggling to put food on their tables, the arts can seem frivolous.

--People in our hometowns need representative activities that they can rally around, like the Imagination Celebration in Seattle. Ultimately, however, any changes that occur have to be made at the top in our communities, with new textbook adoption policies, new school board policies, and other such measures.

--We must involve parents in curriculum development work and discussions. Most educators are reluctant to do this, but when it occurs, parents get very enthusiastic.

School Administrative Structures

--It's a setback almost every time there's turnover in the school

administrative staff at the district and local building levels.

--The bureaucratic layers that exist between people work against implementing change. When change does occur, it has to happen at the top, with the school board, in order for the community to be convinced of the importance of arts education.

--The arts should not be segregated from the rest of the curriculum, nor should the educational system be divorced from the rest of the community.

--The lack of stabilization in the public school system is a real deterrent to working on a shared goal. The school board alone can't be expected to deliver everything that is needed. To accomplish that, we must build a base of support by creating community-wide arts experiences for all stages in our lives and for all people.

--Though it takes time, teachers can be persuaded to believe in discipline-based art education. But there remains a conflict between the art they are eager to teach and the frequent reality of coat hanger mobiles, painted rocks, and gilded macaroni jewelry boxes. We need to clarify what each teacher's job really is; after all, to be an arts educator is different than to be an artist who educates.

Professional Training

--The need for good teacher training is ongoing. Colleges and universities generally don't do a good job of preparing arts teachers, and it's hit-and-miss at the school district level.

--A dwindling number of people have good arts education backgrounds. Many teachers and administrators need teacher training to boost their confidence in their ability to conduct an arts program.

--Definitive and comprehensive materials regarding the benefits of discipline-based art education and its educational application are lacking. Administrators, teachers, and parents are eager to learn more, but materials are needed.

--We need to regard a background in the arts as an asset in candidates for promotion to principalships.

--Many teachers who would like to pursue additional in-service training are "sabotaged" by non-supportive principals who don't believe that arts education is important.

Defining Arts Education to Include Diverse Cultures and Audiences

--There is more often uncertainty as to how arts education fits into programs for students with special needs. Special education teachers generally do not see the arts as important; everyone should have access to the arts, including children with mental and physical disabilities.

--Arts education should include education in the different cultural heritages to be found in the Pacific Northwest and other regions of the country.

--Arts education should include other audiences in addition to students in K-12. We should be teaching prisoners, older people, working adults, and others.

--We must be sure that we communicate to everyone the fact that our definition of arts education is inclusive of all audiences.

Following these observations, the facilitator asked participants to form small groups in order to discuss what they had heard, then to express what was said as factors that encourage or constrain advocacy for a discipline-based approach to art education.

The encouraging factors cited were these:

1) Networking and communication among educators, with the general public, among school districts, between arts organizations and schools, and with other interest groups, such as those who want to see more cultural equity in curricula. Participants cautioned, however, that networking could easily become a constraining factor if the circle of contacts narrows to a familiar elite rather than expanding and becoming more inclusive.

2) The universality of the arts, the diverse responses they inspire, and the class- and color-blindness of talent, demonstrating again that the arts belong to everyone.

3) The search for new, more effective ways to educate children, particularly since current research and scholarship indicate that the arts can help children develop in their general education. New theories about the brain and learning processes are likely to result in a redefinition of education, placing emphasis on an educational balance of cognitive, physical, emotional, and aesthetic development.

4) The establishment of a unit or more of the arts as a requirement for high school graduation or college admission. When colleges place more value on the arts, public schools will do the same. This will also be true as employment opportunities in commercial and non-commercial arts-related areas increase.
6) The higher level of visibility that the arts and arts education now have.

The following constraining factors were also cited in the small-group reports:

1) The lack of a clear, concerted message from all arts advocates on the importance of arts education; the inflexibility of many educators regarding the best ways to teach the arts.
2) The lack of equity for the arts, most especially in school budgets. This sense of fiscal impermanence undermines efforts to incorporate the arts into curricula in a lasting way.
3) The isolation that many teachers feel, especially when they don't have the benefit of extensive networks. The insecurity they feel about teaching the arts stems from their sense of isolation, the lack of in-service education programs in the arts, their limited experience with the arts, and our failure to incorporate the arts in administrator-training and teacher-training programs.
4) The pervasive attitude that the arts are a frill, which suggests that inadequate funding is not the problem in itself, but the symptom. Attitudes need to be changed on a massive scale, and

the unique contribution that the arts make to the quality of our lives needs to be articulated more persuasively.

5) The unwillingness of many communities to be challenged in their views of the arts or arts education. Also, too little solid data exists demonstrating the positive impact of the arts on a child's learning process--data which could be used to support arts advocates and to strengthen the training of arts educators.

6) Inflexibility in daily schedules and course requirements, which can make it difficult for students to take arts classes.

7) The tendency toward elitism in the arts, which undermines the effort to make arts advocacy more inclusive. Sometimes it's simply the "elitism" of shared knowledge and passion, and we should recognize that others may feel alienated by what they do not understand.

Following these reports, the facilitator commented on the group's insightfulness and asked that everyone be prepared to extend the work of the morning session when discussion resumed in the afternoon.

***

First commentator: "The people who need to be convinced aren't present. How do we get them here?"

Second: "Go to them. Speak their own language."

Third: "No, let's start with what we've got. Let's do what we can."

These comments, which opened the afternoon session, described to some extent three reference points in the discussion about arts advocacy: frustration over the disinterest of policy-makers; certainty that a different approach is required in order to be effective; and a guarded optimism that some good can come of working with the resources at hand.

To keep the discussion focused and the task manageable, the facilitator asked roundtable participants to remember that their primary objective was "to sensitize the Getty Center to the factors that it should consider as its work proceeds on discipline-based art education." To accomplish this objective, he said, some process work was needed, and he asked the group to focus on the following questions: "Who are the arts education advocates and what are their roles? What is the process for securing a place for discipline-based art education in our schools?" We need to understand the steps involved, he said, as well as who the players and beneficiaries are.

As an introduction to the discussion called for, a number of roundtable participants sought to articulate further the needs that arts advocates and educators have.

Said Charles Blondino, Director of Curriculum for Education School District 121 in Seattle, "We need to be more emphatic--to walk in the shoes of administrators and others involved. We also need to provide opportunities for people to come to their own definition of arts advocacy. Lastly, we need to establish a state

testing program for students on arts competency. Nothing gets the attention of parents like testing."

In the view of Gina May, State Visual and Performing Arts Supervisor, what was needed was "a crisis to spark public interest and demand--something like the equivalent of Sputnik, which dramatically increased the emphasis in the United States on science and math education."

David Templeton, a faculty member of the art department at Western Washington University, agreed. But, he added, "we also need to provide the means for resolving the tension that a crisis creates. The result will be emotional involvement, passion, and raised consciousnesses."

Another participant observed, "We need non-traditional advocates. That helps legitimize the process. The affiliation of the Rand Corporation with the Getty Center has done more to raise the consciousness of many administrators than anything else to date."

Said Dr. Carol Scott, "We still need help in getting the issue of what constitutes excellence in art education into the national press and national consciousness. We haven't yet delivered the goods in the way that we could."

For Mako Nakagawa, equity specialist for Washington State's Office of Multicultural and Equity Education, the focus of advocacy efforts should be closer to home. "I'm the 'them' you are trying to influence," she said. "Why not start advocating by trying to win me over--by including, inviting, hearing from me?"

Asked how other audiences, other publics, might be included without literally inviting them, one participant suggested that we "extend ourselves into their arenas." Added another, "It's important to include those other publics at the right moment in the advocacy process, but when is that moment?" Seattle PSA President Gail Blaine responded, "At the beginning."

"However we proceed," said David Templeton, "we need to recognize that advocacy does best when times are good."

"Some people are saying that advocacy is more effective when times are good, and others, when times are bad," the facilitator observed. The lesson to be learned, he said, is that arts advocates must tailor their activities to the situation at hand. What is an appropriate response under one set of circumstances may be inappropriate under another.

Roundtable participants agreed that advocacy activity could occur on a number of levels and that the advocacy process should be designed accordingly. These levels might be as follows: national, state, regional (Educational Service Districts), school district, local building, classroom, and the children themselves. It would be especially helpful, one participant commented, if arts advocates had reliable research to tell them what the perception of arts education is among groups and individuals at each of these levels and how those perceptions might be changed.

What the group's work underscored, the facilitator said, is that the following "process elements" will likely appear in a

sound advocacy plan:

1) Identification of multiple levels of activity directed at multiple constituencies;

2) Clarity of goals and clear communication of same;

3) Documentation of current perceptions, and of changes in them;

4) Attention-getting measures, with strategies for action;

5) Emotional involvement;

6) Consciousness-raising;

7) Use of non-traditional advocates to "legitimize" the process;

8) Audience inclusiveness, not exclusivity;

9) Proper timing (what to do, when to do it, who to include);

10) Accuracy in reading a situation, with appropriate responses;

11) Clear priorities at the classroom, program, personal, and professional levels.

The relative priority of these eleven elements can change as they are adapted at each of the seven levels for advocacy activity previously identified (see page 36). In this way, a blueprint for advocacy begins to emerge--one that is flexible enough to accommodate any situation.

At this point, roundtable participants were asked to address, for each of the seven levels identified: Who the audience for advocacy is (who should be drawn into the effort at each level), and what their role should be (in what way they can influence the outcome). Seven smaller groups were formed, each assigned one of these seven levels for analysis. They reported back as follows:

National Level

At this level, the highest priorities are to articulate what children learn in a comprehensive education program that includes the arts, and to groom high-profile individuals who can lead the advocacy effort. The key parties and their roles are:

The President	To endorse arts education; to refrain from cutting funding for it.
Congress	To speak forcefully (particularly those leaders identified); to fund adequately; to make arts education a priority.
National Endowment for the Arts	To increase the Arts-in-Education Program budget; to clarify its position; to advocate with the Congress, the Office of Education, and others.
National Arts Service Organizations (AAM, ACA, ASOL, NALAA, NASAA, etc.)	To focus on arts education as part of their national agendas and in their national meetings; to give the issue space in their publications; to help get the guidelines for accreditation revised.
Department of Education	To conduct research; to help develop curricula; to document successful programs; to endorse the concept of discipline-based arts education.

Professional Arts Education Assns. (MENC, NAEA, etc.)	To foster comprehensive teacher training and evaluation; to advocate; to network.
Cultural Associations	To include arts education on their agendas and in their national meetings; to give the issue space in their publications; to help get the guidelines for accreditation revised.
Other Educational Associations (ASCD, NEA, PTA, etc.)	To advocate for arts education; to network among their own constituents.

State Level

State Superintendents of Public Instruction	To provide leadership; to provide the staff for curriculum development;to promote opportunities for partnerships with other state agencies.
State Boards of Education	To change graduation requirements and other requirements as needed in order to encourage arts education.
State Arts Agencies	To support arts education groups; to help educate communities; to create opportunities for cooperative action.
Governor and State Legislature	To set policy and develop budgets; to provide conceptual leadership.

Teacher Certification Authority	To endorse arts education; to change certification requirements accordingly.
State Educational Associations	To conduct teacher training; to lobby.
Higher Education Board	To establish college entrance requirements in the arts.
State Arts Education Associations	To promote awareness of issues; to provide teacher in-service training; to develop curriculum materials; to sponsor public events that help support and promote arts education; to network and communicate effectively.
State Arts Advocacy Organizations	To lobby; to oversee legislation; to network; to help link arts educators with organizations that can serve them.
State Professional Administrator Organizations	To help screen candidates for administrative positions; to set policy in support of arts education; to conduct research; to communicate through articles and other forums; to provide workshops on arts education; to network.

Regional Level (Educational Service Districts)

Staff of the Educational Service Districts work with school boards, superintendents, curriculum directors, special education directors, in-service directors, teachers, principals, and other education professionals who are interested in the arts and instructional strategies. The Educational Service Districts promote awareness of arts education information; update that information; facilitate communication; assist in developing new resources; and assist in collaboration among school districts.

District Level

School Board	To set policy and communicate it; to advocate; to institutionalize arts education at the district level.
Superintendent	To give the arts education program direction and leadership.
Central Staff	To aid in program implementation; to help develop teachers and curricula; to help secure adequate funding; to facilitate writing grant requests and the grant application process; to foster strong community relations.
Curriculum Division	To give the arts education program definition.

Building Level

Principal	To articulate the value of arts education to the school board and parents; to invite parents to exhibits and performances; to make sure that time is available for teaching the arts and that the arts program meets high standards; to make the arts a requirement (if no curriculum director is available to do so); to allocate funds for the program; to hire qualified teachers with strong arts backgrounds; to encourage enrichment activities and artist-in-residence programs.
Teachers	To talk among themselves and with parents; to work for the improvement of programs.
Arts Program Staff	To show how the arts can be used to help teach other disciplines; to communicate effectively in order to win school and community support; to have clear objectives that are reflected in the teaching.

Classroom Level

Teachers	To develop an effective arts education program that consists of history, artistic skills development, critical thinking, and aesthetics; to provide opportunities that develop an awareness of the arts; to sensitize children to the affective realm of thinking and learning and to let them know that ambiguity is acceptable; to communicate with parents about the arts program; to evaluate student growth; to place high expectations on student participation; to be a role model; to deliver the curriculum effectively; to network with building, district, community, state, cross-curriculum, and administrative personnel; to be true to their own talent.
Students	To experience the arts and formulate opinions and points of view; to contribute to and participate in the arts program; to demonstrate appropriate achievement.
Parents	To communicate with teachers in order to understand goals, objectives,

	expectations, and achievements; to share their own time, talents, and knowledge in the program as appropriate in order to augment the teaching.
Community	To share resources and to become advocates for the teacher.
Principal	To evaluate the teacher, using criteria for excellence in arts education; to observe the students.

Children's Level

The group cautioned that we must be careful not to regard all children as being the same. We must acknowledge their individuality by recognizing their different needs, interests, and abilities. As students--the recipients of arts education--children can also be advocates. They can become more familiar with the arts, participate in arts programs, express their desire as "clients," validate arts activities through their own participation and through discussions with peers, and ultimately become "better consumers of what cultural institutions offer."

Following these small-group reports, the facilitator pointed out two aspects of arts advocacy that had not been anticipated. The first was the idea of advocating with a very specific goal in mind, such as curriculum change or a change in accreditation

requirements. The second was the concept of multiple levels of advocacy and multiple constituencies at each level. The best advocacy effort, he said, will be tailored to the circumstances at each of these levels.

Commenting on the seven levels that had been identified, Anne Focke, an arts consultant, pointed out that they reflected an educator's perspective. An arts administrator might view things differently, she said. The levels themselves might be different, as might the key parties and roles identified at each level. For an arts administrator, the advocacy process would probably place even more emphasis on the National Endowment for the Arts, major arts institutions, individual artists, and so forth. For artists, the focus of the advocacy effort might be painters, sculptors, writers, actors, composers, and others. These different approaches to advocacy must be regarded as compatible, Focke concluded, if the combined work of educators, arts administrators, artists and others on behalf of arts education is to be effective.

Perhaps we have had limited success as advocates, another participant observed, because we have treated these different approaches as competitive and tried to devise only one approach to advocacy; perhaps we have failed to recognize that a broad-based advocacy effort will be comprised of a variety of advocates, audiences, and aims.

In closing, the facilitator asked roundtable participants where the Getty Center for Education in the Arts belongs in this

multi-level view of advocacy, and what the Center's role should be.

If the Center is doing its job well, one educator responded, it should be regarded as having national influence in both the arts and education communities. Its role might be to serve as a bridge between these two communities--to provide a point of intersection for the many different advocacy efforts taking place nationwide.

***

Evaluations of Roundtable II were positive for the attention that the facilitator paid to the group's views; for the self-introductions at the outset of the meeting; for the small-group sessions; for the clear sense of where discussion was headed; and for the way in which the group's ideas were synthesized.

Participants suggested that the afternoon session be more focused, more structured, and faster paced; that a feeling of closure conclude the meeting, perhaps with a networking and advocacy-planning session; that there be more breaks in the longer sessions; and that the meeting room be smaller and less imposing.

ROUNDTABLE III

NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA

APRIL 3, 1986

Most of the participants in Roundtable III were artists and art teachers who were also attending the annual conference of the National Art Education Association (NAEA). Given their involvement in the production and teaching of art, the Center believed they could be especially helpful in discussing the place for creative expression in a discipline-based art education curriculum.

Specifically, the group was asked to address the following questions: What are some of the factors that are incentives and some of the factors that are constraints in maintaining creative expression in discipline-based art education programs? Through what process can the role for creative expression in discipline-based art education programs be secured?

It was later explained that these questions were posed in response to a concern that the Center had heard expressed by teachers, parents and others around the country. Many were concerned, it seemed, that a discipline-based approach to teaching art that incorporated art history, art criticism and aesthetics with the teaching of artistic skills and processes might jeopardize "the excitement and magic" of art. While the Getty Center did not believe that this had to happen, it needed to understand how to address this concern among those who "want to believe in discipline-based art education but who are afraid that creativity will be put on a back burner."

To a certain extent, this concern seemed to be shared by the participants in Roundtable III. When asked outright, for example,

whether or not they worried about the loss of creative expression in the classroom, some responded that they did.

However, it became apparent that for the art teachers assembled in New Orleans, the real threat to fostering creative expression came not from a discipline-based approach to teaching art, but from a variety of other factors that influence what occurs in the classroom. When the conference facilitator asked participants to identify "the pressure points, the levers" to be considered, several other factors emerged--as did the incentives for maintaining creative expression.

In citing these incentives and constraining factors, participants made it clear that they regarded teaching well and fostering creativity as interrelated. Thus, their observations often went to the root of teaching and learning and addressed the larger educational context in which creative expression occurs.

Reporting out of small-group sessions, participants cited the following incentives for maintaining creative expression:

1. Increased communications skills

One group reported that creative expression "retains the excitement and fulfillment of personal expression, and gives students the freedom to share feelings, thoughts and ideas that can't be communicated verbally." Another group observed that creative expression "puts concept above product, and thereby encourages people to express themselves without fear of judgment or failure." Said another, "Art teaches a third language--a visual language--in

addition to the verbal and mathematical languages taught."

2. Increased command of other skills

Among the comments the reporting groups made were: "creative expression provides the opportunity to apply technical art skills and deepen a student's understanding of those skills"; "creative expression strengthens both problem-recognition and problem-solving"; and "creative expression requires hands-on experience, which provides the strongest awareness of the learning process."

3. Increased understanding

One group observed that creative expression leads to greater self-understanding because it "feeds the power of change in the individual." Another cited the capacity of creative expression to encourage "an understanding of the processes involved in creating art, which leads to empathy for the artist's role and helps to develop articulate observers of art." A third group stressed that "creative expression encourages individuality and thereby gives dignity to differences of opinion and different ways of communicating and solving problems."

Other factors were identified by roundtable participants as enhancing the teaching and learning of art. Most frequently mentioned was the value of state mandates requiring art education in the schools, and of college and university requirements for a credit or more of art as a prerequisite for admission. Speaking of state mandates, Norbert Irvine, a consultant with the North

Carolina Department of Public Instruction, cited that state's recently approved basic education plan. The plan requires arts education in K-8, Irvine said, and mandates that arts education be available to every high school student above the eighth grade.

Also cited as important were clear educational goals at the state, district and school levels; access to policy-makers in education; close ties to the community; and an articulate community support network.

Addressing the need for art education programs to be "connected" to the surrounding community and cultures, Xavier University Art Department faculty member John Scott called on educators to "use what's available as resources, including folk art traditions." These traditions, Scott said, are "the garden out of which the fine arts grow."

The constraining factors cited by roundtable participants were:

1. Inadequate preparation of art teachers before they reach the classroom, and inadequate in-service training

Approximately one out of every five participants in Roundtable III cited this as a major factor in determining what was taught in the classroom and how well it was taught. Dr. Charles Qualley, NAEA's president-elect, referred to the need to "convince people who are going to be art teachers that we're not just dealing with art experiences and the manipulation of materials." Speaking of discipline-based art education, Dr. Phyllis Gluck, Professor of Education at Brooklyn College in New York, asserted that "the

underpinnings of art history, art criticism and aesthetics are not being taught in college and university art education programs. To do so requires formal preparation that cannot be gotten from studio training and experience alone." Others present cited "the real need for consistent training for teachers," the need to "help art education teachers with the vocabulary of art," and the need for "comprehensive in-service training."

2. Indifference or ignorance on the part of parents, administrators and the general public about art, the teaching of art and how artists work

As often as they cited inadequate teacher training, roundtable participants also spoke of the attitudes with which they must contend in their schools and communities. NAEA President Robert Curtis spoke of "the need to convince the public that art is a serious study that must be taught sequentially." Ruth Gassett, a teacher from Atlanta, Georgia, addressed "the myths that the public and many administrators have about art education--including the view that art education is something to entertain children and that it has no real connection to child development." Mary Huber, of the Minneapolis Institute of Art, criticized the "public misperception that artists are born whole into the world at 30-35 years of age. The public doesn't understand that artistic ability and an appreciation for art must be developed over time."

3. Limited resources: time, money, energy and supplies

The teaching of art as described by a number of the roundtable

participants entails constantly fighting for the resources needed to do the job well. Nor are the battles limited to trying to secure more funds or maintain present funding levels, though this was important--especially in the hard-hit oil-based economy of Louisiana. Diane Melancon, an artist coordinator in the New Orleans public schools, spoke of the "burnout" that many artists who teach art feel after 3-5 years. Many of them, she said, eventually leave teaching in order to pursue their own art, and that's a loss for the children and the school.

When speaking of budget constraints, said Maurice Sevigny, director of the School of Art at Bowling Green State University, we must also speak of how time is budgeted. "There's an aspect of tempo to this," he said. "Artists don't work in 45-minute units three times a week. We need to consider the time for art that is made available to kids and the implications of that."

The lack of adequate funding for programs was cited by a number of teachers. Said Katherine Schwartz, "No matter how much we do, art education is always the first thing to be cut." Dr. Gluck asserted that the real issue in the inadequate funding of supplies was "the status of the materials. Witness the money spent on computers that go unused--and spent with less accountability than the little that we have for paints."

Other constraining factors cited by the group included rigidity on the part of teachers in their approach to art; the current emphasis on academics and testable, competency-based education as

"the only true path to learning"; the "over-researching" of creativity and the "over-programming and over-lesson-planning" of classroom activities; the focus on teaching art through other disciplines and the view of some teachers and administrators that art education can be entirely project-oriented; the increase both in the number of required courses that students must take to graduate and in the demands on teachers to address non-arts issues, such as drug abuse, during the school day; and the fear of failure and of what others may think, which teachers and students alike may feel.

Later, when the group was asked to elaborate on the specific fears that art teachers have in relation to creative expression, John Scott cited "the fear of appraisal, assessment and poor evaluation." He added, "Creative expression can't be measured" by traditional means, and teachers may be reluctant to encourage it among their students only to be judged themselves by the outcome.

Other fears described by participants included the fear of inadequate preparation. Said Louisiana State Arts Council Director Derek Gordon, "All those years of training don't seem to apply any longer." Dr. Verle Mickish spoke of the fear that some teachers feel who are "threatened by children who are different." Commented another participant, "After awhile, people become afraid to take chances. They get tired, and there's too little reward."

Before turning to the agenda question for the afternoon, the group speculated on how art teachers themselves have unwittingly contributed to the constraints that art education has experienced.

Dr. Phillip Dunn suggested that "we've dug two holes for ourselves: the first because we so often haven't gotten beyond teaching the elements of design, which makes teaching concepts difficult; and the second because we haven't informed ourselves about the financial constraints on administrators, for whom 85-90% of the budget may be committed before the discussion of art supplies begins."

Lita Whitesel asserted that "artists and art educators have to take some of the blame" for the frequent misperception of art and art education on the part of parents and the general public. "We've not done our part in explaining what's going on in the classroom or the connection between art education and child development." As for artists, she said, "some have gloried in being obscure and misunderstood."

Added Dr. Gluck, "Emphasizing that what we teach is nonverbal communication has done us in. Art may be nonverbal, but both we and our kids should be very verbal about the value of the classroom experience."

***

Taking up the afternoon's topic, the facilitator asked participants to identify the process which could secure the role for creative expression in discipline-based art education programs.

In response, a number of people began to list conditions that have a positive impact on art education in general. Among those mentioned were adequate funding, a network for political advocacy,

comprehensive teacher training, sufficient time for art in students' schedules, and development of an educational plan of action backed by leaders at the state level.

As discussion ensued, however, the focus shifted from those conditions to active processes that might influence the role for creative expression. Among the processes were:

--integrating creative expression into all components of discipline-based art education, not just into the creation of art;

--continuing to educate parents and the general public to the value of creativity and the means of nurturing it; participating in community and school discussions about changes in the educational system, and being vocal about the importance of creative expression;

--allying art education with the sciences, where creative expression is associated with legitimate research and not with "playing"; in doing so, stressing that creativity is common to versatility and genius in all fields;

--lastly, concentrating as teachers on what we do uniquely and best, which is teaching our students to make and enjoy art.

Listing seven areas in which work could occur that might encourage creative expression in discipline-based art education, the facilitator again asked participants to form small groups and to identify those processes. Participants were also asked to identify processes that might constrain creative expression.

The seven areas were: creative expression in the classroom; conveying an understanding of discipline-based art education; art

education in general; the educational system; the community; the family and the individual; and political structures.

Again, however, the small-group reports tended to focus on discrete factors which encourage or constrain effective art education in general--such as the existence of magnet schools specializing in the arts--rather than focusing on processes. Although a number of these factors had been cited earlier in the day, many were mentioned for the first time. The most significant of these for each of the areas listed above were as follows:

1. Creative expression in the classroom

Encouraging factors: a controlled environmental setting, ideally a studio; a supportive atmosphere; underlying structure in the curriculum; cooperation from the administration and parents.

Constraining factors: limitations on the time that students and teachers have; difficulty in measuring and evaluating creativity; scarcity of state- or district-level materials dealing with creative expression.

2. Conveying an understanding of discipline-based art education

Encouraging factors: the impact of Beyond Creating; the emphasis on discipline-based art education in the education guidelines of the National Endowment for the Arts; the identification of "model classroom" programs.

Constraining factors: fear of change on the part of art

teachers and school administrators; confusion about the terms (e.g., "aesthetics," "art criticism"); philosophical differences.

3. Art education in general

Encouraging factors: teacher certification requirements that raise the standards of training for teachers; state-mandated art education programs.

Constraining factors: the gap between methods courses and subject-area courses in higher education (e.g., art criticism is not offered in most teacher-training courses); hostility toward art educators from artists teaching studio courses.

4. The educational system

Encouraging factors: the creation of alternative schools and alternative programs specializing in art; the inclusion of art or aesthetics in school-level and district-level goals.

Constraining factors: limited student contact with art, resulting in minimal artistic development; stress on vocational aspects of education; absence of an "educational avant garde" in the schools.

5. The community

Encouraging factors: availability of museums, galleries and similar resources; the existence of arts festivals and other community-supported arts events; greater access to City Hall.

Constraining factors: unwillingness of academia to "tap into" folk art and folk traditions; line-iteming by individual groups in

state and municipal budgets; the fact that art education in many colleges and universities comes under the education department and not the art department.

6. The family and the individual

Encouraging factors: self-esteem and peer acknowledgement; the acceptance of artistic pursuits as part of the social graces and as worthwhile leisure-time activities; a quiet working space, the encouragement of good work habits, and support in the home.

Constraining factors: perceived negative lifestyle of artists; neither status nor financial rewards associated with art; a "throw-away" culture that does not encourage attention to craft or history.

7. Political structures

Encouraging factors: political advocacy networks in support of arts education; state mandates, state educational goals, and state standards for teacher certification that emphasize creative expression.

Constraining factors: ignorance and indifference among too many key political leaders.

***

Evaluations of the roundtable were positive for the wide spectrum of people in attendance and for the setting, but negative for the excessive time spent on individual introductions at the outset of the meeting.

ROUNDTABLE IV

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

MAY 1, 1986

To begin discussion on the issue of necessary financial and administrative resources, four panelists from the Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and Decatur, Illinois, school systems were introduced. The art education programs in their districts had been among the seven chosen to be featured in Beyond Creating, which had been published just a year before Roundtable IV convened.

With the use of panel presentations, the format of the Chicago roundtable differed from that of previous meetings. The facilitator explained that the purpose of these presentations was to provide roundtable participants with a first-hand account of how art education programs had been established, staffed and funded in two school districts. The afternoon would be devoted to "looking for the common factors" in these districts and in those represented by other roundtable participants--factors "which support or inhibit securing resources for discipline-based art education programs."

In reviewing the development of an arts education program in Decatur, panelists Dr. Donald Wachter and Nancy Roucher described themselves as the "inside and outside" person, respectively. As associate superintendent of Decatur School District 61, Dr. Wachter was able to help the school system respond to the outside pressure being brought to bear by arts education advocates. At the same time, as founder and director of Project HEART (Helping Education through Arts Resources for Teachers), Ms. Roucher was able to build the coalition and establish the program that led to "the institutionalizing of arts education in Decatur."

Dr. Wachter began by saying that the theme of his and Ms. Roucher's presentation was that outside pressure is an essential component of education politics, and that such pressure, if handled skillfully, can change a school system for the better. This was the case in School District 61, he said, which he described as fundamentally stable, financially conservative, and one of the largest districts in Illinois outside of Chicago. As the "inside" person, his role was to help facilitate the debate about arts education by building close working relationships with other administrators, teachers and community groups and by "opening doors" for Ms. Roucher. The coalition they formed was instrumental in Project HEART's success and managed to withstand even a period of "a year or so" when federal funding "began to dry up." It was at this point that they began to prepare the school board for "picking up both the commitment and the tab itself."

The eventual success of the coalition in convincing the school board to assume support of Project HEART derived in part from the recent adoption of the Illinois Plan for the Arts in General Education, Ms. Roucher said. That plan "reflected many of the aspects, values and goals of discipline-based art education" and "provided the leverage that Project HEART needed." Ms. Roucher also stressed the importance of "linkages to the community" and of winning the trust and voluntary involvement of the teachers who took part in the program in its early stages. Both the linkages and the trust were strengthened with the creation of an advisory

committee of community representatives, administrators, teachers and others. It was because of the strength of this coalition, Ms. Roucher said, that she believed that "if Project HEART could just keep treading water" despite a period of financial hardship it could gain support locally and "become institutionalized in the budget."

The process of becoming "institutionalized" was aided by a number of other factors. These included involvement with the Columbia Magnet School, which enabled Project HEART to work with one entire school and not just with teachers from different schools throughout the district; the publicity generated by the Getty Center's research and by the Project's inclusion as a case study in Beyond Creating; and the "transitional" financial support that the Project received through the temporary reallocation of school funds that had been earmarked for transporting children to Decatur Area Arts Council-sponsored events.

Despite these successes, both Dr. Wachter and Ms. Roucher were quick to point out that institutionalizing the Project was not without problems. Dr. Wachter spoke of "learning the hard way" that teacher contracts had to be renegotiated in order to accommodate the additional in-service training time expected of staff. Once this training became mandatory, Ms. Roucher observed, it was "painful" to encounter the apathy and hostility of some teachers; fortunately, she added, the enthusiasm of voluntary participants had already established "the tone of the program."

Dr. Wachter summed up the experience in Decatur by asserting that having an advocate on the inside of the school system and another on the outside working as a team was an effective arrangement. He cautioned, however, that no program should rely on one or two people alone. Rather, what is required is a broadly based coalition, a "strategic vision," and continuing leadership both inside and outside the school district.

Both Dr. Wachter and Ms. Roucher agreed on the factors that needed to be present to make a partnership such as theirs work effectively.

The "outside" person, Ms. Roucher said, needed to bring to the effort a well-defined program, administrative leadership, an ability to work with the school structure, some fundraising skills, and a talent for building coalitions.

As for the "inside" person, Dr. Wachter said, what is needed is a clear sense of goals and objectives, a willingness to reallocate resources and to restructure organizationally as needed, development opportunities for staff and incentives for their participation, and the same talent for building coalitions that is required of the "outside" member of the team.

Dr. Richard Doornek and Dr. Lee McMurrin began their presentation on arts education in Milwaukee with a slide show and an overview of various public schools in the district "that feature or in some way include the arts in their curricula."

Dr. Doornek, the district's arts coordinator, then focused on

the Elm Creative Arts School. Reorganized as a magnet elementary school to help eliminate segregation in the district, Elm offers "a model arts program with all the essential components of discipline-based art education," he said. "At Elm," the district's catalogue states, "all of the arts are treated as areas of learning and development with the same status and educational emphasis as other areas of the curriculum." Dance, theatre and music are available at the school in addition to the visual arts, and all are related to other basic education subjects, said Dr. Doornek, "in order to make the teaching of those subjects more interesting and more effective." Among the resources at the school is an active gallery which teachers, students and parents help program and which has become "the visual center of the curriculum." Other outside resources, such as local museums, are also utilized, Dr. Doornek stated. In addition, teachers receive "extensive development time."

Dr. Doornek briefly described several other schools in the district and their arts programs. These included Roosevelt Middle School, where an Afro-American art teaching package was developed with the help of Links, Inc., a league of black professional women. At Lincoln High School, artists exchange teaching time for studio space in an innovative barter arrangement. In these and other schools in the district, he said, curriculum development has been an ongoing process that depends heavily on building consensus.

In closing, Dr. Doornek asserted that arts programs not only

are attractive for parents, teachers and students interested in the arts, but also produce "a tremendous amount of learning and a dynamic environment." He pointed again to Elm Creative Arts School as one example of this. At Elm, he said, students rank first in the district in cognitive skills, whereas they had once tested in the bottom ten percent. This is part of the available evidence, he concluded, that there ought to be more arts programs and that they ought to be more fully utilized.

Dr. Lee McMurrin, superintendent of the Milwaukee Public School District, traced the development of arts programs in the district to a "Statement of Education and Human Rights" passed by the school board in 1975. This "belief system," he said, established the foundation for all the improvements that followed. It specified that: 1) all public schools should be integrated; 2) urban children should have the finest educational opportunities available; and 3) education should be as voluntary and enthusiastic as possible, with full parent involvement.

Teaching specialties, Dr. McMurrin said, were developed by "cutting the staff loose with the instruction that anything goes, as long as it's excellent." The result is that there are now some forty specialty schools in Milwaukee, ranging from an emphasis on German or French, to intensive computer training, to a Montessori school, to programs in the arts. In these and other schools in the district, the most effective staff development consists of a full array of activities that start at the building level. He

pointed out that principals can request project funds--including funds for staff development--from a "budget pool" designated for this purpose.

All programs, Dr. McMurrin concluded, are scrutinized during the annual long-range planning process at the building and district levels and during a comprehensive evaluation that takes place every seven years. Annual plans are aired at public hearings which, in turn, generate new program ideas. Every eight years, after the district-wide evaluation is completed, efforts are devoted to correcting the problems that have been identified. "But what all this comes back to," Dr. McMurrin asserted, "is the belief system at the foundation of these developments."

In the discussion that followed these presentations, roundtable participants asked the panelists to address questions on several topics:

On the use of art specialists in the Decatur system:

Dr. Wachter indicated that the economic hardships that Decatur was experiencing had limited the use of specialists. While there is one art specialist in each of three middle and high schools, Ms. Roucher explained, there is only one specialist for all twenty elementary schools.

On the use of aestheticians, critics and art historians:

In responding, Ms. Roucher referred to Dr. Harry S. Broudy, whose teachings, she said, had been influential in encouraging the

teaching of aesthetics, art criticism and art history. She saw an increasing need for all three areas of expertise and reiterated that Project HEART had, for two years, been incorporating instruction in art history. She was also aware, she said, that teachers had to achieve "a basic comfort level" with art before they could begin to teach art history, criticism or aesthetics confidently.

On Project HEART's in-service program:

Ms. Roucher described it as "very participatory," saying that it includes written material that describes the basic terminology of art and seeks to train teachers in all aspects of an art lesson: looking at a work, discussing it, listening to what others have to say about it, and evaluating it.

Following these questions, the facilitator asked the group to focus more on the issue of necessary administrative and financial resources for art education. Three questions addressed this topic:

On the importance of parental and community support in obtaining stable funding:

All of the panelists agreed that such support was crucial. Dr. McMurrin referred to the advisory committees that exist at the building level in Milwaukee--committees on which parents must be represented. Parents must also be involved in a school's annual long-range planning process. Both parents and other members of the community can have an impact during the district-wide hearings, he said, adding that having "lots of hearings" has proven useful

in giving people a sense of ownership of their school system.

Dr. Doornek said that in his experience "board policy is the surest route to permanent funding." To ensure that arts education becomes part of policy requires involving parents and keeping the school board attuned to what is happening with the arts program. But he cautioned that permanent funding should never exempt a program from regular scrutiny, which is necessary to ensure its effectiveness.

Dr. Wachter outlined a five-point program for "institutionalizing a program and ensuring its stability": 1) find qualified personnel to run the program who are committed to it; 2) give the program priority ranking and allocate development funds for it; 3) secure the school board's blessing for the program's goals and objectives; 4) establish a good staff development plan to move from the pilot stage to the institutional stage; and 5) be prepared to redefine staff roles and to restructure organizationally as needed.

Ms. Roucher concluded by asserting that a well-constructed plan for applying outside pressure and offering constructive suggestions could be very powerful. This requires parental involvement and parental impact, she said. She also recommended being willing to pursue in-kind support and to reallocate funds in a district's budget--even temporarily--in order to put together the funding needed to carry a new program through its developmental phase.

On how to make the transition from temporary funding to full-fledged, institutionalized support:

Dr. Wachter maintained that this required a "district-wide reordering of money and priorities." Dr. Doornek recommended developing good communication with teachers, their unions, administrators, and the community. In his response, Dr. McMurrin used a metaphor that others would repeat from time to time throughout the day. Institutionalized support, he said, required designing a program that can happen "within the square, not as an add-on." The "square," he said, is the available staff, money and time in the school day. "If it can't happen inside the square," he said, "you won't be able to keep your program funded."

On the importance of independent validation in generating support for an arts program:

Ms. Roucher said that validation of some sort at some point in a program's development is essential, though the form it takes can vary. "There has to be a success story," she said, "and it has to be told by people who are not part of the program." In some cases, this may even be an outside evaluator who is hired to review the program. What is important, she concluded, is to make good use of any "critical event" that can benefit the program, whatever its source.

Both Dr. McMurrin and Dr. Wachter agreed but added that validation could also come from within the school system. Dr. McMurrin referred to the "internal" validation of having students

enroll voluntarily in arts programs when they could sign up for something else. Dr. Wachter said that the fact that other teachers duplicated the strategies and techniques that their colleagues had learned through Project HEART was also a form of validation.

The final question in this phase of the roundtable concerned the limitations of time and resources available to an administrator who may be interested in discipline-based art education but who has many other educational obligations.

June Dudeck, principal of Hawthorne Scholastic Academy, a public school in Chicago, described her situation there in a somewhat exasperated tone. The school has art offerings, she said, but not a cohesive program of the kind that panelists had described. She had no money for such a program, she explained, no art specialists, and no spare time. She has succeeded in involving parents and teachers "as much as possible," but teachers get no in-service training in art. All in all, she concluded, arts education at Hawthorne was "very choppy, very helter-skelter." What, she asked, could someone in her position do? She needed help in planning and developing an arts program, but where was she to go for that help?

The facilitator asked the panelists to respond to Ms. Dudeck's question as though it was not specific to Chicago. "What is the trigger resource?" he asked. "What should we look for first in order to make something happen?"

Ms. Roucher said that she appreciated the "urgency" in Ms.

Dudeck's question. The answer "is to tap into networks of expertise of the kind represented in this room." Call on people, she said, and ask for advice. She recommended starting with the state board of education and with statewide alliances of arts organizations and arts educators. These organizations can provide planning consultants, help establish goals and identify resources.

Dr. Doornek suggested that "the trigger is simply having a plan with time and thought and logic evident in it." Such a plan, he said, is hard for a school board to resist. Other panelists agreed, but Dr. McMurrin added that "before the plan there must be a philosophy--some common understanding of what you believe in and what you want as the outcome." Bringing in academic specialists to help discuss this question could prove worthwhile.

At this point, the facilitator asked the group to compile an "inventory" of the factors that had been cited that encourage or constrain "freeing up administrative and financial resources for discipline-based art education." The two lists that the group developed were as follows:

Encouraging Factors

--Strong coalitions among teachers, school administrators and parents

--Adequate start-up funding

--Thorough planning and clear goals and objectives

--Close working relationship with local colleges and universities that can provide consultation and in-service training

--Qualified, supportive staff and supportive teacher associations

--Effective advocacy efforts

--Visibility and promotability of quality arts events and experiences associated with the arts program

--Reciprocal needs of artists and arts programs, leading to such arrangements as the exchange of studio space for teaching

Constraining Factors

--Lack of support from administrators, teachers and parents

--Low public priority given the arts, and the perception that the arts are just for fun or entertainment

--Lack of political savvy on the part of arts educators

--Lack of imagination and vision on the part of administrators, teachers, community leaders and others

--National studies that emphasize skills achievement and that concentrate only on reading and math

--Inability to evaluate easily the cognitive and affective skills that are acquired through arts education, and the lack of national studies in this area

--Perception that arts education costs too much and is not cost-effective

--Lack of confidence that teachers may feel about teaching art

--Lack of art specialists to assist teachers and to deliver services

--Fragmented curriculum and lack of consensus on curriculum design

--Perception that the arts are an elitist subject, and that art specialists don't care to work with general education teachers

Following the creation of this "inventory," the facilitator asked participants to conclude the morning phase of the roundtable by identifying the "process mechanisms" that can help free up

resources. Ten mechanisms were listed by the group:

Process Mechanisms

--Creating long-term planning committees involving teachers, administrators, parents, artists, arts advocates and arts council representatives

--Going through a pre-planning stage; "planning to plan"

--Conducting a needs assessment

--Building coalitions with teacher unions, local colleges, parent groups and other key supporters and key resources

--Effectively promoting the final plan

--Having a "good, solid problem worthy of action that others haven't been able to solve"

--Encouraging state legislation that mandates minimum requirements in the arts

--Identifying excellent practitioners, whether inside or outside the school system

--Developing a model program that can serve as "the flagship" for the school district

--Appealing to a community's pride and competitive instincts by comparing local arts education programs with those in neighboring school districts

***

Turning to the agenda for the afternoon, the facilitator indicated that the process discussion that had concluded the morning phase of the roundtable also served to introduce the topic for small-group tasks to which the rest of the day would be devoted. The goal, he said, was to identify "the processes through which both financial and administrative resources for discipline-based

art education can be secured." In addressing this topic, participants were asked to think of themselves "as community organizers who are attempting to focus your advocacy efforts."

Five groups were organized for this purpose. One was asked to identify the elements of the process used to secure resources at the state and national level. Another was asked to do the same for the school and community level. And three groups were formed to address the process as it occurred within the school district.

Speaking for the state/national group was Richard Gage, coordinator of the arts-in-education program of the Illinois Arts Council. The elements, he said, were those organizations at the state and national levels which could be of assistance in developing and helping to secure support for discipline-based art education programs. The state board of education, state arts council, and statewide alliances of arts organizations and of arts educators were all examples of such resources, he said. At the national level, the resources included the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities, the American Association of Museums, and the Department of Education, among others, as well as various national foundations.

The processes involved in taking advantage of these resources, Mr. Gage said, required that advocates develop sophisticated grant-writing skills, perhaps with one development officer shared by several districts; that they become politically adept, as well as more aware of statewide resources that can be used in the

advocacy effort; and that they encourage local leadership.

Ms. Kathy Brown, program coordinator for the national PTA, spoke for the school/community group. She identified five steps that were part of the process of securing resources: 1) organize and take advantage of community resources, including parents--get them interested and involved and feeling a sense of ownership in the art education effort; 2) build coalitions with local businesses, social service organizations and arts organizations; 3) undertake whatever can be done in the way of fundraising, however small; 4) secure scholarships from the PSTA and other local groups in order to encourage student participation; and 5) promote the program through community shows of student art and by letting people know about students' accomplishments.

Speaking on behalf of the three groups that addressed the process for securing resources within a school district were Ronne Hartfield, director of Urban Gateways; Mary Pulsifer, art supervisor for the Clarendon Hills Schools; and Kathy Walsh, director of educational programs for the Terra Museum of Art. Among them, they identified the following steps in the process:

--cultivate the support of a key school administrator who can help "convert" other administrators

--identify someone on the "outside" of the school system who has a sense of mission and who can act as a catalyst for support

--develop a strong, rational proposal that includes an "executive summary" and that is written in language that appeals to administrators

--establish an advisory council of teachers, community leaders, key administrators and others whose support is needed

--create a sense of need through community pressure, state education mandates, competition with other school districts, and an effective advocacy campaign

--develop a pilot program that has the highest possible level of administrative involvement and that seeks initial support from community arts organizations, parent groups and local businesses

--seek outside evaluation and validation of the pilot program and publicize this "critical event"

--expand the pilot program and push for full "institutionalized" funding within the school district's budget

Following these small-group reports, the facilitator recognized Dr. Jean Unsworth, a faculty member of the art education department of Loyola University of Chicago, who expressed the concerns of a "splinter group." Ms. Unsworth said that she felt that discipline-based art education was being "interpreted too strictly" by the Getty Center on the assumption that the Center advocated a rigid formula of "one-quarter production and three-quarters other elements." Since many of the programs represented at the roundtable did not have these same proportions, Ms. Unsworth said, she questioned whether or not "we are denouncing our own convictions by our very presence here."

The facilitator accepted Dr. Unsworth's message "as input" but cautioned against believing that the Getty Center ever intended to "annoint" programs that followed a strict one-quarter/three-quarters formula. It is not the Center's intention to create or support one "correct" program, he said; instead it hopes to encourage the discipline-based art education concept in whatever form is best

suited to a particular school setting.

Before returning to the small-group format, the facilitator asked participants to identify other fields or specialties that had successfully gone through the process of securing resources and to explain their success. Among the fields identified were mathematics and the sciences, computer studies, special education, physical fitness and career education. Their success, suggested Kent Lydecker, director of museum education at the Art Institute of Chicago, stemmed from advocates being able to identify, define and articulate a specific, significant problem, and then to win wide consensus that the problem needed to be solved. In each effort, he said, there was "a certain moment that galvanized action." He concluded that before art can be an integral part of education in America, the lack of it "must be established as a problem that needs to be solved."

Martha Alexakos, who is with the Chicago Public Schools, commented that, unfortunately, "ninety percent of what kids learn is to follow the rules and get the right answer." What society really needs, she continued, are people who can solve problems creatively, and she stressed the value of expressing the arguments for arts education in these terms. Nancy Roucher agreed, adding that being willing to commit significant resources to solving an agreed-upon problem was also crucial. Mr. Lydecker asserted that "it's a matter of institutionalizing the commitment. Once that's achieved, the question becomes how to use the resources instead of

how to get them."

Ronne Hartfield suggested that the "new American contract ideology" was an underlying force that worked against arts education. That ideology, she explained, asks "What do I get in return for what I put in?" The problem is that "it's difficult to demonstrate what people get from the arts without speaking in abstract, high-minded terms about 'critical thinking' and the like." What advocates of discipline-based art education need, Ms. Hartfield concluded, is something concrete to offer--"something that enables us to say, 'Here, you'll get this back.'"

At the conclusion of this discussion, participants again broke up into small groups to identify the sequential steps that can be taken in the process of securing financial and administrative support. Where does the process begin, the facilitator asked, and what steps follow from that beginning?

Reports from the five groups were similar in many ways. Taken together, they identified the following sequence: 1) agree upon the problem that needs to be solved; 2) develop a strong program to address that problem; 3) cultivate leadership and build a strong advocacy campaign; 4) win the support of parents and community leaders by involving them in advisory committees, task forces and other similar mechanisms; 5) make collective recommendations for policy changes that acknowledge the importance of discipline-based art education; and 6) publicize all success stories.

Following these reports, Valsin Marmillion of Hunt/Marmillion/

Associates, consultants to the Getty Center, closed Roundtable IV with "a few words about advocacy." In his experience, he said, people tend to minimize the value of their participation in an activity such as the roundtable. In fact, he asserted, each person present "represents the viewpoints of many others and is helping to form the opinions that could drive changes in art education." Those changes may take different forms, he concluded, but they would all be affected by "the joint statement you have made today--a statement which may not be repeated for several years."

***

In her closing remarks, Ms. Duke noted that although Roundtable IV was the last in the series, the ideas expressed in the meeting would be used to shape the national conference on discipline-based art education that the Getty Center is sponsoring in Los Angeles. She expressed her hope that everyone who had participated in the roundtables would be able to attend.

Evaluations for Roundtable IV were brief, with a few participants suggesting that the composition of the small groups change occasionally, that summaries of previous roundtables be available in advance, and that there be more discussion of the rationale behind discipline-based art education prior to engaging in the process discussions.

APPENDIX

ROUNDTABLE PARTICIPANTS

BOSTON ROUNDTABLE

Maida Abrams
President
Massachusetts Very Special Arts Festival

Lorrie Berenberg
Coordinator of Art Classes and Workshops
Boston Museum of Fine Arts

Francesca Bini Bichisecchi
Graphic Arts Teacher

Dr. Donald Brigham
Director of Visual Arts
Attleboro High School

Donald Brown
Supervisor, Visual Arts
Boston Public Schools

William J. Burback
Director, Department of Education
Boston Museum of Fine Arts

Judith Burton
Associate Professor
Boston University

Jane Clark Chermayeff

Richard Clancy
Chairman, Art Department
Belmont High School

Iris Fanger

Richard Friedman
Director of the Institute for the Arts
The Cultural Education Collaborative

Barry Gaither
Director
Museum of the National Center
for Afro-American Artists

Judy Grunbaum

John Hanson
Legislative Liaison for the Governor's
Office of Educational Affairs

Anne Hawley
Executive Director
Massachusetts Council on the Arts and Humanities

Nadya Higgins

Barbara A. Hildt
Massachusetts State Representative

Abigail Housen
Coordinator, Graduate Program in Art Education
Massachusetts College of Art

Nancy Howard
Coordinator of School and Community Programs
Boston Museum of Fine Arts

Barbara King
Teacher, Ippswich School

Diane Korzenik
Chairperson of the Art Education Department
Massachusetts College of Art

Martha Krom
Curator of Education
Worcester Art Museum

Nancy Langstaff
Associate Professor
Lesley College

Ellie Lazarus
Director of Museum School
DeCordova Museum

Dr. Elma Lewis
Director
National Center for Afro-American Artists

Joan Little

Lou Lorenzen

Michael Kim Marshall
Manager of Instructional Services
Boston Public Schools

Kay Matthew
Massachusetts Council on the Arts and Humanities

Catherine Mayes
Museum School Coordinator
Brockton Art Museum

Robin McGoff
Art Director
Quincy Public Schools

Patrick Mogan

Dr. Bart O'Connor
Superintendent
Attleboro Public Schools

Anita Page
Principal
South Hadley High School

Dr. Marilyn Pappas
Chair, Department of Fine Arts
Massachusetts College of Art

Jeanne Pond
Assistant Curator of Education
Worcester Art Museum

Linda Poras
Director of Education
Fitchburg Art Museum

Milton Rhodes
President
American Council for the Arts

Marcia Rosenberg
Museum School Director
Danforth Museum

Lidia Scher
Art Chairperson
Acton Public Schools

Klare Shaw
Massachusetts Council on the Arts and Humanities

Mary Ellen Smith
Chairperson, Massachusetts Board of Education

Dante Vena
Chairman, Art Education Department
Southeastern Massachusetts University

Liz Weld
Education Editor
The Boston Globe

SEATTLE ROUNDTABLE

Susan Albert
Staff Development, Special Education

Karen Antonucci
Past President, WAEA
Middle School Art Teacher

Lee Bassett
Artists-in-Residence Coordinator
Washington State Arts Commission

Gail Blaine
President
Seattle Council PTSA

Chuck Blondino
E.S.D. 121
Seattle, Washington

Robert L. Cathey
Curriculum Consultant

Faith Clover
Fine Arts Specialist
Multnomah County E.S.D.

Ricki Deragisch
Project Director
KCTS/9 Public Television

Roger Fernandez
United Indians of All Tribes

Anne Focke
Consultant

Bonnie Pitman Gelles
Associate Director
Seattle Art Museum

Jan Graves
Facilitator, Arts in Education
Northshore School District

Nyra H. Gray
Administrative Supervisor
Seattle Public Schools

Mary Ann Hagan
Administrative Coordinator
Washington Alliace for Arts Education

Gina May
Supervisor
Visual and Performing Arts, SPI

Judith Meltzer
Arts Resource Specialist
Seattle Public Schools

Sandy Bricel Miller
Art Instructor
Pacific Arts Center

Mako Nakagawa
Equity Specialist
Office for Multicultural and Equity Education, SPI

Merv Nyberg
Executive Director
Seattle Elementary School

Carl Petrick
Executive Secretary
Seattle Arts Commission

Neal Porteo
Director of Music and Art
Kent School District

Susan Jane Russell
President
Washington Art Education Association

Jerome Saulter
Seattle School Board

Dr. Carol Rogel Scott
Chair of Music Education
Seattle Pacific University

Diane Shope
Seattle Arts Commission

Dave Templeton
Art Department
Western Washington University

Sue Templeton
Art Coordinator
Federal Way High School

Mark Terry
Director
Northwest School

Ray Thompson
Seattle Pacific University

Mayumi Tsutakawa
Community Arts Coordinator
King County Arts Commission

Wanda Westcoast
Pacific Arts Center

Lael Williams
Visual and Performing Arts Program Manager
Edmonds School District

Joan Yoshitomi
Washington Association for
Asian and Pacific American Education

NEW ORLEANS ROUNDTABLE

Ron Adams
Department Chairman and Visual Art Coordinator
Mercer Island High School

Charlotte Bailey
Acting Assistant Professor of Art
Louisiana Tech

Nancy Berry
Adjunct Professor of Museum Education
Southern Methodist University

Judith Burks
Past Public School Visual Arts Coordinator
Artist in the Schools

James M. Clarke
President
Texas Art Education Association

Shirley Trusty Corey
Supervisor
Arts in Education
New Orleans Public Schools

Beth Cornell
Executive Director
Performing Tree

Robert W. Curtis
President
National Art Education Association

Ruth Gassret
Arts and Humanities Consultant
Georgia Department of Education

Phyllis Gold Gluck
Professor of Education
Brooklyn College, CUNY

Derek Gordon
Executive Director
Division of the Arts

Frank R. Gross
Core Faculty, Visual Arts
New Orleans Center for Creative Arts

Thelma M. Hahn
Elementary Division Director-Elect
National Art Education Association

Deborah Heyman
Coordinator, The Alexander Julian Foundation
for Aesthetic Understanding/Appreciation

Mary Huber
Supervisor
Arts Resource and Information Center
Minneapolis, MN

Norbert W. Irvine
Visual Arts Consultant
Division of Arts Education

Myrtle Kerr
Louisiana State Art/Humanities Supervisor

Amy Kirschke
Director of Children's Education
and Visual Arts Education
Contemporary Arts Center

Betti Lake
Art Educators of Iowa

Lynda Lowe
Elementary Divisional Chair-Elect
West Region
National Art Education Association

Nancy MacGregor
Department of Art Education
Ohio State University

Diana Melancon
Coordinator, Project Arts Connection
New Orleans Public Schools

Verle Mickish
Professor of Art and Curriculum
Director, Art Education
Georgia State University

Louise Mouton
Visual Artist/Artist in Residence
Orleans Parish Schools

Jack Osier
Art Education
Evergreen School District

Mary Jane Parker
Curator of Education
New Orleans Museum of Art

Jean Pichotta
Visual Arts Teacher
New Orleans Center for Creative Arts

Charles Qualley
Professor, Department of Fine Arts
University of Colorado

Milton Rhodes
President
American Council for the Arts

Kathy Schwartz
Graduate Assistant
University of Arizona

John T. Scott
Xavier University Art Department
Louisiana State Arts Council

Maurice Sevigny
Director
Bowling Green State University School of Art

Rosina L. Short
President
New Mexico Art Education Association

Leslie Ann Tichich
Consultant, Rural Arts

Daniel Vidrine
Commissioner, State Arts Council
Louisiana Art Education Association

Dee Davitt Waller
AIE Coordinator
Division of the Arts

Lita Whitesel
Professor of Art
California State University

Phillip Yuum
Associate Professor of Art
University of Southern California

CHICAGO ROUNDTABLE

Martha Alexakos
Office of Instruction Services
Chicago Public Schools

Martin Anderson
Principal
Coventry School

Arnold Barbknecht
Director of Curriculum
Highland Park High School

Carolyn Blackmon
Chairman of the Education Department
Field Museum of Natural History

Dr. Will Booker
President
Illinois Art Education Association

Dr. Willard Boyd
President
Field Museum of Natural History

Dr. Robert Campbell
Superintendent, District 65

Dr. Richard Doornek
Art Coordinator
Milwaukee Public School District

June Dudeck
Principal
Hawthorne Scholastic Academy

Fred Fine
Commissioner, Department of Cultural Affairs

Richard Gage
Coordinator, Arts in Education Program
Illinois Arts Council

Roger Gilmore
Dean
School of the Art Institute of Chicago

Dennis Gorbowski
Niles North High School

Elissa Gross
Arkansas Arts Council

Ronne Hartfield
Director
Urban Gateways

Mina Halliday
Educational Consultant
Illinois State Board of Education

Margaret M. Harrigan
Associate Supeintendent
Office of Instruction Services
Chicago Public Schools

Dr. Jerome J. Hausman
Visiting Professor/Consultant
School of the Art Institute of Chicago

Adrienne Hirsch
Executive Director
Illinois Arts Council

Brother Donald Houde
Assistant to the Superintendent
Office of Catholic Education

Robert Johnson
Chicago Vocational High School

Lynn Julian
Alexander Julian Foundation

Al Kimbrough
Associate Principal
Evanston Township High School

David Knoebber
Illinois Art Education Association

David S. Logan
Chairman, Arts in Education Advisory Panel
Illinois Arts Council

Kent Lydecker
Director, Museum Education
Art Institute of Chicago

Dr. Ora B. McConner
Assistant Superintendent
Chicago Public Schools

Dr. Lee McMurrin
Superintendent
Milwaukee Public School District

Joan Monroe
Chicago Public Schools

Anita Moore
Principal
Howland School

George Munoz
President
Chicago Board of Education

Michele Olsen
University of Illinois

Angela G. Paterakis
Professor, Art Education/Art Therapy
School of the Art Institute of Chicago

Mary Pulsifer
Art Supervisor
Clarendon Hills Schools

Madeline Murphy Rabb
Director
Chicago Office of Fine Arts

Rebecca Riley
Director of Special Grants
John D. and Katherine T. MacArthur Foundation

Nancy Roucher
Director
Project HEART

Dr. Robert Stake
University of Illinois

Dr. Jean Unsworth
Art Education Department
Loyola University of Chicago

Naomi Vine
Director of Education
Museum of Contemporary Art

Dr. Donald Wachter
Associate Superintendent
Decatur School District 61

Dr. James Waldorf
Principal
Plainfield High School

Kathy Walsh
Director of Education
Terra Museum of American Art

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

THE J. PAUL GETTY TRUST

Harold M. Williams
President and Chief Executive Officer

Leilani Lattin Duke
Director, The Getty Center for Education in the Arts

ROUNDTABLES

The Roundtables were organized and coordinated by
Hunt/Marmillion/Associates, Los Angeles, California.

Direction
Valsin A. Marmillion

Staff Assistance
Daylanne Johnson

Discussion Facilitators
Rob Eskridge
Roundtables II, III and IV

William Spencer
Roundtable I

DOCUMENTATION

The Proceedings Report was produced by Keens Company, New York, New York, by arrangement with the American Council for the Arts.

Preparation and Writing
William Keens

Editorial Direction
Leilani Lattin Duke
Valsin A. Marmillion
Daylanne Johnson

Distribution
The Getty Center for Education in the Arts
Los Angeles, California

The American Council for the Arts
New York, New York

THE GETTY
CENTER FOR
EDUCATION
IN THE ARTS

1875 Century Park East, Suite 2300, Los Angeles, California 90067-2561